



CITY OF MILWAUKIE

Missing Middle Open House Summary

April 3, 2019

Presentation Boards Tallies and Comments

Current Code has Challenges:

1. **Location:** Cottage Clusters are not currently allowed in Single Family Residential (SFR) zones.

Would you support:

- A. Allowing Cottage Cluster with detached buildings in all SFR?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 19
- I have concerns = 8

Comments:

- Where is the community land trust model?
- Where is allowance or allowing for tiny housing?
- Depends on the size of the lot – do not want it crammed or too much density.
- Depends on how many and the site. Don't want it to look like just crammed houses with no greenspaces. Greenspaces are what makes our city great.

- B. Allowing attached buildings within ¼ miles of Frequent Transit?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 17
- I have concerns = 4

No comments.

2. **Fees/Costs:** Existing SDCs for a \$200k smaller home is \$9,781 or 5% of the total cost.

Would you support reducing/waiving SDCs for smaller homes to incentivize more affordable housing options.

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 19
- I have concerns = 4

Comments:

- Reduce but not waive.
- Re: the % of cost difference, how is this a reduction? We need SDCs so current residents don't subsidize developers of future housing.

- Agree we need SDCs to support all the new development.
- Reduce, don't waive. Concerns with sidewalk infrastructure never being built.

3. Parking Standards: Current parking standards compete with buildable site area, eliminating the possibility of two extra units.

Would you support:

A. Allowing all parking to be provided on-street, if possible?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 5
- I have concerns = 19

Comments:

- Doesn't work. Pushes problem into ROW. Becomes Public Works problem. Will not work until you can restrict number of vehicles someone can own.
- Narrow streets in Milwaukie make it hard for parking, pedestrians, bicycles. Have concerns over whether USPS would continue to deliver mail. My carrier refuses to deliver if she doesn't have ample clearance and having more competition for ROW could cause lots of issues for USPS. (They should get over it but seem really picky).
- Even cyclists and transport riders have cars! I'm a bicycle commuter and still park my car.
- Too much density is why I moved from Portland. Regulating by density ensures we keep some greenspace which is why I moved here.
- Serious concerns. Build plenty of onsite parking!!!!!!!

B. Allowing head-in or angled parking?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 16
- I have concerns = 4

Comments:

- Will require widening of street, possibility beyond property lines.
- You get more parking but less open street. Maybe OK on wider streets.

C. Requiring 0.5 auto spaces and 1.5 dry, secure bicycle parking spaces per primary unit?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 4
- I have concerns = 14

Comments:

- Remember, cars might not be our future, old cities weren't built for cars, new cities are. What are future transit options? What do we want our future community to look like?

- Do not like half spaces. Does not make sense. You can put bike in bedroom.
- In 25 years, people may have less cars but now people need parking for at least one car per home.
- Aging population = bikes not viable.
- Support this within close proximity to transit.
- My aging parents take public transit. They don't drive.
- STOP! with the bike thing. Middle age people live here and we use cars. The City Council is cozy with the Portland Bike Alliance, but this is Milwaukie. It's OK to be a car person. Stop discouraging realistic approaches for existing residents.

4. Regulate Form, not Density: Current cottage cluster standards are subject to the density restrictions of the base zone.

Would you support regulating form, not density, using these elements: height, setbacks and allowed intrusions, lot coverage, common area, unit type (attached v. detached)?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 10
- I have concerns = 9

Comments:

- Need room for trees and greenspace, even in cottage clusters.

5. Height: Current single-family residential zones allow three stories; current cottage cluster standards appears to cap height at 1.5 stories.

Would you support reducing height from base zones: Cottage Cluster, 2 stories, down from 35 ft in base SFR zones; height can never exceed base zone height?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 22
- I have concerns = 5

Comments:

- Do not build higher than 2.5 stories!
- Consideration for older adults needs.

6. Max Number of Units: On larger sites, there is no incentive to develop as the number of units is maxed at 12. This results in lots of unbuildable space, or expensive units.

Would you support eliminating requirement for maximum number of units for larger sites?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 14
- I have concerns = 9

Comments:

- Do not eliminate but increase the maximum.

- Greenspace is important. If there is no maximum, there will be no greenspace.
- Require open space.
- Protect the canopy!
- Some of these graphics show awfully high % of lot coverage – what is the impact on large trees and on stormwater?

7. Density Constraints: Due to density constraints, smaller sites are forced to build fewer, more expensive units in order to make the development pencil.

Would you support eliminating the requirement for maximum density to free up smaller sites?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 16
- I have concerns = 5

Comments:

- Do not eliminate but increase the maximum.

8. Setback Requirements: On a 6,000 sq ft site, only the front porches of the allowed cottages can be constructed given setbacks.

Would you support:

A. 15 ft front yard setback for a cottage cluster?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 11
- I have concerns = 4

Comments:

- Need more info. How does this compare to existing?
- Yes, no big difference.
- Zero setback.

B. Allowing walkways, sidewalks, porches, steps, ramps, drive aisles, and retaining walls in the front setback?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 24
- I have concerns = 2

Comments:

- Isn't this currently allowed?

C. Allow parking, steps, ramps, drive aisles, and retaining walls in the side and rear yard setbacks?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 20
- I have concerns = 1

Comments:

- Isn't this currently allowed?

A New Approach to Housing:

How could cottage courts be designed for existing lots in Milwaukie?

1. Narrow Lot Design. (Lot size: 0.5 acres)

What do you think about this concept?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 11
- I have concerns = 6

Comments:

- How are redevelopment opportunities supported or hampered by other policies, say tree preservation? Other policy can also create barriers to housing. Is that being examined?
- Okay but you could get more parking lot.
- Better with less parking/impervious surface.
- Not enough parking. Get real. Our mayor rides a bike so he unrealistically expects the rest of us to ride a bike. Elitist point of view. Please design and build for real people who already live in Milwaukie and make this place already great!
- Love the fact that there is no requirement for parking. Great!!
- Need onsite parking. Not all streets can support more on-street parking.
- Need to keep greenspace and canopy when these sites are developed. No reason to live here if we don't.

2. Open Space Redesign. (Lot size: 2.0 acres)

What do you think about this concept?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 10
- I have concerns = 3

Comments:

- Really good density for lot size. Possibly get more parking.

3. Full Lot Redesign. (Lot size: 0.4 acres)

What do you think about this concept?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 13
- I have concerns = 5

Comments:

- Side yard and backyard setbacks from fence line are important so as not to adversely impact current neighbors. Need space for trees.

- Cottage clusters is a move in the right direction. I'd like to see modified building codes to allow for tiny housing. This would open up space for parking and green space.

4. **Full Lot Redesign #2** (Lot size: 0.6 acres)

What do you think of this concept?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 10
- I have concerns = 7

Comments:

- Each unit could potentially get its own parking space.
- If the city is going to persist in the \$100 business license for rental units, they better back off the excess water bill and other fees!!!
- Again, think realistically. You must have adequate parking!!
- Like the idea that no parking is allowed. Mobility for next 60 years will be less car-oriented.
- This allows for parking and trees.
- They need to build the "future" street.

ADUs and Current Challenges

1. **Limited Allowance of ADUs:** Only one ADU is allowed in single-family zone.

Would you support allowing up to 2 ADUs? Allowing ADUs per residence is the most significant change to enable ADUs as a workforce housing strategy.

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 19
- I have concerns = 6

Comments:

- Two ADUs? 1 attached and 1 detached? Or 2 detached? Prefer to former.
- It doesn't matter as long as within code. Good idea!

2. **SDCs and Fees for Smaller Developments:** SDCs and fees impact small units disproportionately.

Would you support reducing SDCs and improvement requirements? Exploring opportunities for fee reform can enable ADUs as a workforce housing strategy.

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 25
- I have concerns = 1

Comments:

- Heck yeah!
- We have 1 ADU now and we get charged sewer and all the other non-water fees per structure whether empty or not. Is the city going to back off some of these other fees since a business license is required?

- If waiving or reducing SDCs/other fees, how might you ensure ADUs are used for housing and not for short-term rentals? Make sure the policies support the goal.
- Reduction of fees and building permits incentivizes the building projects of owners, as opposed to those of developers.
- No reductions for larger developers or housing that is not affordable.
- Reduce fees for homeowners who are adding a unit or two. Increase fees for developers/investors who are buying "teardowns" and maximizing density.

3. Parking Requirements Compete with Buildable Area: Two off-street parking spaces are required which compete with the buildable area of a site, reducing units and affordability.

Would you support reducing parking requirements? Especially for smaller and more constrained sites, reducing parking requirements to one per site would allow for more ADU development.

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 18½
- I have concerns = 10½

Comments:

- If it's small enough, then it is okay, i.e. grandma who can't drive.
- Serious concerns. You must have parking. Not all of us ride bikes.
- Ditto. ↑
- Need parking for each home.
- Must think more of future need to own/park a car. We may all soon be ordering a riding in a driverless vehicle.

4. Location of ADUs: Existing code prevents ADUs in front of a single-family home, within 40 ft from the front lot line, or within the side and rear setbacks depending on the size.

Would you support allowing location flexibility, to allow flexible siting of the location of an ADU anywhere on the lot?

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 20
- I have concerns = 6

Comments:

- Yes, keep it flexible as long as it is design and size compliant with house.
- What kind of flexibility? Front of house? 40 ft of front lot line or side and rear setbacks? Flexibility on the side and rear setbacks are something I support.
- Site-dependent (x2)
- Flexible but consider existing neighbors.
- Not in the front yard, but side or rear yard. This will look piecemeal otherwise.

5. ADU Size Based on the Size of Primary Units: Maximum ADU sizes based on the size of primary units presents inequities by disproportionately limiting ADUs on lots with smaller dwellings, typically owned by lower-income households.

Would you support maximum ADU sizes? Instead of dictating maximum ADU sizes by the size of primary units, a baseline standard maximum ADU size should be established for all units to prevent inequities.

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 22
- I have concerns = 4

Comments:

- Need more info on what this could look like. Greenspace and canopy on large lots should take precedent.
- In theory, okay. Need more info.
- This is great. When I was looking at building an ADU in Portland, their ratio was a huge barrier because I had a small house on a large lot. Very much support this.

6. Long Review Processes: An unnecessary lengthy review processes for ADUs can hinder the development of more affordable units.

Would you support streamlining the review process? Development review processes should be streamlined for ADUs to be permitted by cheaper and shorter review process as long as the ADU meets size and other code restrictions.

Tally:

- I'm supportive = 29
- I have concerns = 0

Comments:

- OK as long as no variances past a Type I land use review (sic: are allowed). If requesting more than that, need to go through regular permitting process.
- Extremely streamlined requirements, please!

Comment Cards:

- I would hate to see Milwaukie turn out like Sellwood. I have a lot of friends that live there and are very unhappy. They have put tall apartment buildings with no parking. People still need cars and a place to put them even if they use mass transit. I would really like to build a duplex in my backyard but there is a problem of a very expensive road. Tall buildings also shade gardens and people's yards.
- We need a mandate woven into all this which addresses the great, (avoided), equalizer; We all age. Housing needs to acknowledge the demographic profile regarding aging AND economics. This is more about universal design that retaining parking spots. And sidewalks are critical but do need to be addressed other ways.
- I'm interested in the concept/development of a co-housing ecovillage. I favor what was shared this evening and I appreciate the work being done. My concern conceptually, is that the large workforce that earns minimum wage or a bit more couldn't afford and of the numbers I saw. Realistically, the ADU's could be built for a lot less than I saw, and there should be no restrictions to prevent that. Not your providence, maybe, but living wages need to be paid, period. P.S.

Median Female earner in Clackamas is 39,700—think single moms; they couldn't afford.

- Portland reduced costs of permit fees and greatly increased building of ADU's.
- Build out public transportation areas first.
- Allow conversion and expansion of non-conforming structures (eg. Garages) as ADU's.
- We as a city can take the time to really discuss and incorporate views of current citizens or we can look like the worst of Gresham. Thoughtful design, allow room for trees and breathing space of current neighbors. Transit oriented development is a great idea with parking as most of us have cars and will for many years. Pushing parking on to neighborhood streets is wrong and only causes resentment of neighbors and other problems.
- I think it is a good idea in general. Can be done well—will be a benefit to the community. Concerns: Make sure however this is done that:
 - Tree canopy and greenspace is maintained as much as possible. Greenspace and trees are important for our health and wildlife.
 - ADUs or cottage clusters are used for purpose created and not for short-term rentals with high costs or for Airbnb for tourists/vacationers. Defeats this purpose otherwise.
- Our property is 4515 SE Roswell as illustrated on the cottage cluster projections. We want to be included and/or be informed on future meetings and updates.
- Cottage clusters should be considered for Hillside Park area now being master planned by Clackamas County and Milwaukie. Possibly give/transfer ownership to existing residents of a new cottage, and so they pay only property taxes and maintenance of the new home. No more rental assistance needed. Instead, generate property tax revenues.
- Work with County on sewage fees. Now you can add another bathroom to an existing home and those fees do not increase. If you add a tiny house in your backyard, sewage fees double.
- Alex Joyce did a nice job with his presentation. The format was smart, too, in allowing people to casually weigh in with stickers and post-it notes. Hope the feedback is useful, and good luck going forward in the process! P.S.- As a Sightliner, I appreciated the mention of “missing middle” multiple times tonight.
- I currently live at 4125 SE Monroe Street with my wife and two daughters. We are exploring the idea of turning our garage into an ADU, but it would only happen if measures are taken to reduce or waive the costs of SDCs. As a family of four in the metropolitan Portland area, we need to find a way to supplement our mortgage payment alongside the rising costs of living in the Pacific Northwest. I hope measures are adopted to make ADUs available and cost effective for homeowners and renters.

- I'm a widow, self-supporting (work full time) and am approaching fixed income days. I'm terrified of running out of affordable (and safe and livable) housing. What will I do, where will I go?